

Journal of Interdisciplinary Feminist Thought

Volume 1
Issue 1 *Women's Work*

Article 1

November 2006

The "Fair" Sex: Working Women at London's Fairs, 1698-1732

Anne Wohlcke
Eastern Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/jift>

Recommended Citation

Wohlcke, Anne (2006) "The "Fair" Sex: Working Women at London's Fairs, 1698-1732," *Journal of Interdisciplinary Feminist Thought*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/jift/vol1/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Interdisciplinary Feminist Thought by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@salve.edu.

The "Fair" Sex: Working Women at London's Fairs, 1698-1732

Anne Wohlcke

Anne Wohlcke is an assistant professor of history at Eastern Kentucky University in Richmond, Ky.

In Edward Ward's satirical periodical piece, *The London Spy* (1698-1700), his two protagonists visit London's well-known and frequently satirized Bartholomew Fair. While there, one of the main characters spies a woman "labouring in the Crowd, like a *Fly* in a Cobweb." Compelled to protect this seemingly vulnerable woman, the protagonist escorts her out of the crowd, defending her from "the rude Squeezes and Jostles of the careless Multitude."¹ Only after he has safely guided her from the crowd does the "London spy" realize he has been duped. As the woman "Shuffl'd [back] into the Crowd," he discovers the extent of her ploy – using her femininity as a decoy, this woman had rewarded the protagonist's "civility" by picking his pocket. Embarrassed by his "over-care of [the] Lady, and carelessness of [him] self," he uses this incident to instruct his companion about the dangers of women in Bartholomew Fair. One had to be as mindful of these ladies and their unpredictable nature "as Country people are of Stags in Rutting-time; for their accustomary ways of Rewarding Kindnesses, are either to take something from you, you would unwillingly part with; or give you ... that which you would be glad to be without."²

When Ward wrote this series, London's city officials were in the midst of a long campaign to suppress London's fairs. During this campaign, fairs were frequent settings in didactic and satirical literature and print depictions which illustrated their ill effect on London's and wider England's society and commerce. Central to these portraits were depictions of unruly public women who attended, performed, or provided goods and

services at fairs. New conceptions that urban work space should be regular and orderly contradicted the temporary (though increasingly permanent) and mobile commerce of fairs, which were work spaces in which laboring men and women profited seasonally by providing goods, food, entertainment, and housing.³ Debates about the danger of London's fairs often singled out women's behavior as most representative of the broader threat of such commerce – to social critics, women's behavior embodied fair disorder. Women continued to work at fairs, however, in the face of both legal efforts to restrict urban festivity and popular representations featuring unruly female characters at fairs.⁴ Historical evidence of women's work at fairs reveals that they retained a significant and constant presence in this industry throughout the early eighteenth century, even as they were ridiculed and attacked in a print culture informed by emerging middling notions of proper, urban gendered conduct.

Though negative stereotypes had little impact on women's continued work at fairs, they did contribute to "middling" readers' own notions of which spaces and what activities were appropriate for women.⁵ "Middling" people were those who profited from economic trends between 1690 and 1750 that contributed to urbanization and also benefited Londoners involved in trade, industry, the professions, and commercial agriculture. Prosperous middling people, who now outnumbered England's traditional landed elite, empowered a rising consumer society.⁶ This new group differed from both gentlemen and traditional laboring people, so contemporaries referred to them as constituting "the middling sort" or a "middle station."⁷ Middling men and women were increasingly interested in material goods and leisure activities – they avidly consumed entertainment, services and a new genre of print culture that included novels, newspapers,

and periodical journals, through which they developed shared understandings and looked for ideas about self-improvement.⁸ In reality, satirical literature critiquing women who worked at fairs was aimed at a middling audience, and such negative representations had little impact on working women's lives at fairs during the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Despite satires and criticisms of female fair workers, women continued to work at fairs in a variety of capacities, including performance, fair booth management, acrobatics, food service, and inn-keeping.

The Problem of Women's Work at Fairs

Writers and artists who critiqued fairs contributed to a broader debate about their usefulness. City officials and urban reformers sought to regulate London fairs throughout the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. These reformers considered fairs and street markets to be an undesirable and outdated form of commerce.⁹ Most of London's chartered fairs were established primarily for market purposes during the Middle Ages, but as consumer goods became more widely available in London's network of shops, urban authorities perceived the commercial function of fairs as overshadowed by their entertainment.¹⁰ However, while city fathers wrestled with fair regulation, these supposedly obsolete institutions only continued and, in some cases, increased. Urban amusement was developing into a form of commerce on its own, and itinerant traders and peddlers, food service workers, and entertainers continued to supplement their living with seasonal employment at fairs, which existed alongside permanent London businesses. Women who found work at fairs sold food and drink and goods ranging from trinkets such as dolls or ribbons to china. They were also involved in the entertainment industry

of fairs and worked as dancers, actresses, or singers, and even as play booth managers. At all levels, women were visible participants in the seasonal festivity of fairs.

By the early eighteenth century, a period when proto-industrialization prompted new notions that labor ought to be focused on production and free of idleness, many social observers and urban authorities increasingly viewed fairs as distracting from productive commerce. Fair workers were temporary laborers, who pieced together work from a variety of sources.¹¹ Among those working at fairs, women who sold goods at markets were “visible, talkative, and competent.”¹² Working outdoors without the obvious supervision of husbands or fathers, female fair workers defied dominant understandings about both proper commerce and gendered work roles, which Protestant Europe defined as occurring within a male-headed household, defined by Susan Dwyer Amussen as a “godly commonwealth.” Here, women were ideally responsible for running the household on the inside, while men were responsible for external family affairs.¹³ The presence of women working openly at fairs, not always visibly attached to men, challenged gendered notions of proper work.¹⁴

Representing Unruly Women at Fairs

Popular literature was one means through which London’s critics expressed their anxieties about life, work, and social order in the rapidly expanding metropolis. Writers of popular works on fairs often evoked negative representations of unruly women to encapsulate their fears that London’s patriarchal authority ineffectively quelled potentially disorderly urban amusements such as fairs. In many popular tracts, women are particularly singled out as undermining men and male labor at fairs. Such writings

employed symbols of unchecked female power and “topsy-turvy” gender order at fairs as shorthand for the general threat fairs posed to London’s social order and safety.¹⁵ Gendered ideas transmitted via such representations were largely misogynist, painting women as threats to male productivity and health. Yet, while periodical literature advised men to avoid specific entertainments or fair women, women in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries were not explicitly advised to discontinue their work.

London city and Middlesex county officials never singled out the presence of women at fairs as especially destructive, but they implied that London’s commercial spaces should be devoted to mannered and masculine commerce, not seasonal and disorderly festivity in which women were actively involved.¹⁶ In their orders regulating fairs and their attending entertainments such as drama, gaming, and drinking, city officials voiced their concerns in terms of the amusement’s impact on men. London’s aldermen and Middlesex justices wanted to make urban streets safe for apprentices, servants, and other laboring men.¹⁷ While city and county records note little about women’s presence at fairs, the era’s wider print culture reveals that efforts to regulate and define commercial space in London were gendered. Literary and print culture implicated public women for contributing to the disorder and danger of fairs and reveals that the regulation of fairs was informed by understandings of gender-appropriate behavior, both because it sought to earmark and preserve specific areas of London as spaces that should be devoted to orderly and male commerce and because the informal campaign against fairs in print culture utilized gendered imagery in its depictions of the danger of fairs.

Though gendered imagery contributed to an eventual redefinition of what constituted suitable work for women, as Debroah Valenze, Bridget Hill and others have shown, it is important to remember that these ubiquitous images present a lopsided view of the ways in which women participated in and profited from London's fairs.¹⁸ Behind satirical depictions of working women at fairs are the actual experiences of women. These women's available work opportunities were certainly shaped or influenced by their own, their family members', and workingmen's ideas of appropriate female occupations. However, their own and their families' understandings of what was appropriate differed from beliefs held by London's middling male journalists and artists. Satirical commentary on women's behavior at fairs was informed more by artists' and writers' own notions of how women ought to contribute to society and the economy rather than by the needs and beliefs motivating women's choices to undertake work at fairs.

Representing the Fair Sex at Work

Ward's periodical series, *The London Spy*, encapsulates many concerns regarding women's work at fairs. In particular, his work critiques women on public display who do not conform to developing middling notions of appropriately gendered behavior. Ward's two male protagonists equate public unruliness with the presence of visible female performers on more than one occasion. They reveal their own misogynist gender expectations when they observe female acrobats at Bartholomew Fair, where they join a crowd observing two female acrobats walking on their hands. These women's performance becomes symbolic of women's "true" usefulness. The London spy is "pleas'd to see the Women at this sport, it make 'em seem to have a due Sense of the Ills

done by their Tongues, to degrade which, they turn'd 'em downwards, giving the Preheminency [sic] to their more deserving Parts; for which Reason they practic'd to walk with their Arses upwards."¹⁹ Women inverting the "natural" condition of men by standing on their hands enhanced what these men felt was their appropriate female function. Their "tongues" were de-emphasized while their reproductive capability was accentuated. After witnessing these women, the urban spectators conclude "a Woman is a meer Receptacle" and standing on legs should be considered an unnatural posture for a woman.²⁰ This depiction not only critiques women who worked at fairs as acrobatic performers, but reinforces notions that such women existed outside of and were a challenge to a properly ordered city.

Ward's depiction upheld notions of traditional social hierarchy in which women represented a potential threat to social order if they lived outside the authority of their families, as many women who performed at London fairs did. Years of misogynist discourse dating to early Christianity represented women as synonymous with "nature." Gender historians argue that women have often been viewed as closer to natural forces and less civilized and disciplined than men. As the benefactresses of Eve, the original temptress and sinner, women were seen as potentially disruptive members of society.²¹ In response to this discourse, early modern England's social order situated women within families. Here, their dangerous potential could be contained and directed to their other "natural" qualities which benefited society – such as childrearing.²² While not all women actually lived up to these expectations, this was the criterion by which men judged their public behavior. Women who lived apart from traditional sources of authority were

potentially disruptive members of society, a fact not lost on Ward or other writers and artists who depicted unruly women in their work.

In 1738, John Bancks wrote a poem inspired by Hogarth's *Southwark Fair*, a painting which makes dangerous public femininity central to a critique of London fairs. In his painting, Hogarth not only places above the crowd a placard advertising a dramatic presentation of the fall of man, but he centrally depicts a female drummer who has been the subject of much speculation by art historians.²³ Bancks views this female drummer in the context of concern with fair disorder, and presents her seemingly innocent beauty as the catalyst for the danger befalling Southwark Fair and its patrons:

See how the Louts, with eager Stare,
Own Cupid's Reign, ev'n in a Fair!
Smit with the painted Drummer's Face,
They long to try the leud Embrace.
Ah Lads! 'tis Poison all within;
To 'scape the Pain, avoid the Sin!²⁴

Meanwhile, as men's attention is focused on this siren of Southwark Fair, the balcony of a booth collapses and threatens the female performers above as well as the goods, trades people, and fairgoers below. What, specifically, is the poison mentioned by Bancks? Among other maladies, love sickness, distraction, and the slow down of the city's production.

According to popular representations of fairs, men who braved the crowds intentionally risked their vitality and earning potential – both might be damaged by deceptive or seductive women. Tempted by the delicious smells of food cooking at fairs,

men had to ignore pre-typhoid Mary servers such as “dirty *Molly*, or the greasier *Kate*”.²⁵ They might also lose themselves as they witnessed feminine spectacles overhead, especially if they happened to observe the rope dancer “Lady Mary.” At Bartholomew Fair in 1703, this seductress intrigued viewers including an “old gentleman” who admired her performance. A witness to this man’s fascination exclaimed, “[L]ook upon the old gentleman; his eyes are fixed upon my Lady Mary: Cupid has shot him as dead as a robin.” The man observing the impact of the rope dancer’s performance on audience members remembered how a different rope dancer once infatuated him. Comparing Lady Mary to his own favorite, he says: “[T]hose roguish eyes [of Mary] have brought her more admirers than ever Jenny Bolton had; it is a pity, says I, she has no more manners, and less ill-nature.”²⁶

Should men view and experience such encounters with female performers and fair-goers and still emerge unscathed at the end of the day, they had one last temptation to withstand. When night fell, men negotiated their most dangerous obstacle in the darkened allies or cloisters of fairs. Their virtue, honor, and physical and financial well-being were all in danger should they succumb to the apparent pleasures of female flesh or gaming. At Bartholomew Fair, these activities were held in the cloisters of Bartholomew Hospital, separated from the fair by the hospital gate. When men entered this area, they encountered women such as the “lewd Matron,” with a “red Brandy Face,” described by one poet sitting at the entrance to a bawdy house in the cloisters.²⁷

From breeches wearing and thigh-exposing rope dancers to greasy female servers in food stalls to the prostitutes in the darkened cloisters of St. Bartholomew’s Hospital, women at fairs were depicted as the conduits of distraction, disease, and overall social

disorder. This singling out of women at fairs as destructive to every aspect of commerce and men's lives leaves us with the impression that their work at fairs may have been limited. While this commentary combined with the legal efforts of London's city officials defined London's streets as appropriate space only for controlled, orderly, and masculine commerce, their idealized work space did not emerge quickly, if at all. From at least the end of the seventeenth century to 1732, women continued to work at fairs, and some were even quite successful and influential. Gendered representations from the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries denote urban streets as locations of male commerce, but recorded evidence of women's working lives in London reveal that this configuration was contested, ignored, or both, and not easily imposed by city officials and social critics.

Locating the Fair Sex at Work

Historical evidence demonstrates that women who worked at fairs were much less colorful than depicted in popular literature and that such portrayals had little impact on female fair-workers. An examination of women's actual work at fairs cautions us against interpreting cultural representations of female fair-workers as evidence that their work spaces constricted during the late-seventeenth through mid-eighteenth centuries.²⁸ Though there was a sexual division of labor in the early-eighteenth century, it did not entail the type of rigidly defined separate work spheres associated with the nineteenth-century middle class, which increasingly associated women's work with the domestic sphere and men's work with the world beyond the home.²⁹ Women who worked at fairs continued their occupations despite negative literary representations. Historians argue

that women's presence in great numbers as street peddlers does reflect a certain sexual division of labor.³⁰ For example, more urban early-modern-European women may have worked in street trades such as itinerant peddling, and fairs were a space in which women were welcome as workers.³¹ This type of casual labor usually required little capital and could be done as a supplement to the family economy.³² Historians of women's work understand such labor to be an occupation that was especially attractive to early modern women, who were increasingly excluded from skilled occupations available to guild members, who were usually men.³³ However, fair records complicate our understandings of early modern gender and work and reveal that low-skilled labor was by no means solely performed by women. Though in some cases urban markets were dominated by women, London fair records reveal that large numbers of men joined women as workers participating in this form of part-time and seasonal occupation. At the same time, fair records contest notions of a strict sexual division of labor among the types of jobs men and women undertook at fairs. At late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth-century fairs, women often worked in managerial positions usually considered "male," especially as fair booth proprietors.³⁴

While recorded evidence of women's work as street sellers and itinerate peddlers is scarce, their applications for licenses to "show" (*monstrare*) wares or performances or sell food or drink at fairs are recorded in surviving records from Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court. These records provide an untapped resource that sheds new light on women's working lives in early modern England. Pie Powder courts were held in fairs and markets for their duration and had jurisdiction in commercial matters.³⁵ Until recently, scholars examining London fairs have had access to the Pie Powder Court

records only from the late-eighteenth century, but these records usually record only the last names of those seeking licenses to exhibit goods or shows at the fair. The following discussion is based on the rolls from 1709-1732.³⁶

Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court rolls contain very little detail other than brief records of disputes and listings of those who acquired licenses for the fair. The advantage of the earlier rolls is that they record both the first and last name of licensees, making it easy to uncover trends such as the numbers of people advertising shows at the fair versus those who actually acquired licenses as well as percentages of women acquiring licenses to work in the fair. Though later records from Bartholomew Fair lack full names, they do specify which goods or type of entertainment each individual was licensed to show, though they do not contain much detail beyond that.³⁷ Records from the early-eighteenth century merely state which type of license each individual purchased – *pro venditione esculent* (for the sale of food), *pro venditione poculent* (for the sale of drink), *pro venditione gingerbredd*, and, the most common license, *pro venditione monstrare* (to “show” – wares or performances).

The Pie Powder Court records provide an important glimpse into the ways in which women participated as legitimate laborers in late early-modern London. These records support historiography, which argues that large numbers of women in the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries supplemented their family income through itinerate work such as selling goods at markets or fairs.³⁸ They reveal, also, that at Bartholomew Fair many women sought licenses to sell their goods and services legally at fairs. Though it is not always easy to determine which goods or services these women provided, in some cases additional information about them is available in other sources.

For example, some women who purchased licenses also took out advertisements in newspapers in which their entertainment is described.³⁹ Actresses or play-booth managers are particularly easy to locate; however, the trade of the large majority of these women is presently unknown.

It was possible for fair traders to evade the legal process of obtaining a license. This is clear if the names of those who advertised shows are compared to the names of people who obtained licenses. In some cases, people were brought into the fair's court and fined for failing to obtain a proper license.⁴⁰ Since it was possible to evade licensing, the Pie Powder Court records are not an entirely precise record of the numbers of men and women who worked at fairs, and, in the case of women, we must consider whether or not these records reflect accurately their numbers. Though such labor required a low level of capital investment, the economic status of these women varied, and some may not have afforded fair licenses.⁴¹ The most successful hawkers would have had the expendable capital required to pay the licensing fee of London's chartered fairs, while others may have attempted to circumvent licensing and sell their goods illegally.

Another type of "women's" occupation that profited during fairs was victualling or innkeeping. Peter Earle demonstrates that among a sample of working London women, wives who ran businesses devoted to food, drink, and entertainment made up three-quarters of his total sample.⁴² Though usually operated as a family business, these occupations were considered well-suited for women's domestic skills, and women had much agency in carrying out daily operations.⁴³ Whether or not these were occupations considered "male" or "female," they nevertheless were vital to the smooth running of London's fairs and stood to lose much income should fairs be successfully curtailed.

Women working in these family businesses influenced urban policies by resisting orders regulating fairs and continuing their business. These women also had clout when representing their businesses to the outside world. Records from the Old Bailey, for instance, reveal that married women who ran taverns and inns often testified in lieu of their husbands when their family businesses were robbed. Elizabeth Davil described that she “kept a Victualling House” in the Parish of St. Sepulchres and that, during Bartholomew Fair, she took in a large amount of extra income. In retelling how a servant stole from her hidden stash, Davil reveals that she oversaw her family’s business, overseeing her cook and servants and also interrogating a servant whom her son suspected committed a theft.⁴⁴ Another woman, Ann Chapman, ran an inn near West Smithfield. It is not clear if she was widowed, but from all appearances, she ran this business alone. Chapman appeared in court when tenants (a husband and wife) stole a bottle of gin, which they in turn sold in the fair and failed to pay their rent according to their lease agreement.⁴⁵ In another case, Sarah Ansell testified that as she operated her family’s fruit-selling business from their cellar window in Southwark Fair, a customer stole money from a trunk kept in the back of their cellar. Though her husband made a statement at the accused thief’s trial, his wife clearly operated the business on a daily basis and provided the “expert” testimony.⁴⁶

Women’s ubiquitous and active work at London fairs is represented in a print from a fan sold at Bartholomew Fair during the 1720s. Intended as a souvenir of one’s visit to the fair, it does not satirize the activities as Hogarth’s *Southwark Fair* does for that fair. Though the fair’s activities seem *too* orderly, this fan does depict a number of women at work in various capacities. Women are pictured preparing and selling

sausages, taking admission to play booths, hawking fruit from a basket, selling food from a wheelbarrow, offering toys and other trinkets in a stall, and, of course, acting in performances. We can imagine that these women represent various economic positions. A woman who has leased a space for a stall or booth has paid considerably more than a mobile woman with a basket or wheelbarrow, who might have more easily evaded paying a license. A woman engaged in either performing or taking admission at a play booth may have been a member of a larger London theatre company, may have been working with her husband, or may have operated this business alone. Even Hogarth's more unruly depiction of a fair gives us some idea of women's work. Fleeing from beneath a falling play booth balcony is a nicely dressed woman who had been hawking fine china. This china saleswoman can be immediately compared to the less-finely-attired woman on the ground in front of her booth, who is running what looks to be a portable gaming table.⁴⁷ The fact that Hogarth chose to depict his most reputable female trader in the most immediate peril reveals his notions of respectable women's suitability for an occupation such as fair trading.

Licenses Issued in Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court
1709-1732⁴⁸

Year	Number of licenses issued	Number of licenses issued to women	Percentage of total licenses issued to women*
1709	10	2	20%
1710	15	4	26%
1711	18	4	22%
1712	17	3	18%
1713	29	3	10%

1714	45	8	18%
1715	46	12	26%
1716	52	10	19%
1717	10	2	20%
1718 (no record)			
1719	80	18	23%
1720	105	25	24%
1721	145	45	31%
1722	113	27	24%
1723	100	21	21%
1724	129	31	24%
1725	125	28	22%
1726	120	28	23%
1727**	70	15	21%
1728	19	3	16%
1729	28	3	11%
1730	37	3	8%
1731	39	9	23%
1732	25	3	12%

*Percentages are rounded to the nearest hundredth

**This year Thomas Carbonell, English Sword Bearer and Thomas Elderton, Common Cryer of the City of London, “came in person to this Court and individually petitioned that the aforesaid licences be revoked and monies received for them should be restored, and that no such licenses should be granted again in the future. And in return, of their own free will, they offered and undertook to pay £20 paid annually, revoked the licences and restored the money received for them. And [the Court] also concede that no more licences of this sort would be granted in the future, saving the rights of this liberty.”

If we examine the numbers of women who acquired licenses at fairs between 1709 and 1732, even accounting for variations in record keeping and keeping in mind people’s evasion of licensing, it is clear that women were consistently present in noticeable numbers. During the 1720s, there was an overall increase in the number of licenses issued, and the percentage of licenses issued to women increases slightly. Increases and decreases in the numbers of licenses issued coincide with city efforts to limit the fair to the original three days stipulated in its charter. The London

Swordbearer's lease, which entitled him to farm profits from fair licenses, expired in 1708, and the city officials saw this as their opportunity to finally restrict the tenure of an occasion they considered a growing nuisance. In this year, London's Court of Common Council issued an order restricting the fair to its original three days.⁴⁹ Lower numbers of licenses in 1709 most likely reflect the city's early vigilance in carrying out this order. By 1715, however, the court was obliged to issue yet another order reminding Londoners of the fair's regulation. The steady increase in licenses issued from 1709 to 1715 reflects the fair's renewed growth. Only seven years after the court's order, the number of licenses issued by Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court nearly quadrupled. Clearly, enforcement had abated. The prospect of trading for fourteen days instead of three attracted more peddlers and "showmen" to the fair. This increase of licenses occurs, also, during what Sybil Rosenfeld calls Bartholomew Fair's "theatrical heyday."⁵⁰ Not only did London's established companies of "strollers" continue to present dramatic entertainment at fairs, but they were joined by actors, actresses, and managers from London's theatres. This influx of "professional" actors eventually declined with the imposition of the 1737 Licensing Act, which limited dramatic (spoken) entertainments to London's patent theatres.⁵¹ However, we are not able to witness the impact of this decline in the records of Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court because existing records end in 1732, only to begin again in 1790.

Throughout all of these developments, the number of licenses issued to women remains constant, hovering around 20 percent, with occasional drops below this number and a peak of 31 percent in 1721. This continued presence of women as peddlers or exhibitors demonstrates that they remained active workers at fairs. This number reveals

also, however, that women did not make up the bulk of trade at London's fairs (at least officially licensed trade). While many women obviously did find work at urban festivals, it was by no means a venue dominated by working women. Depictions of London fairs that portray dangerous female performers or sellers make these women seem ubiquitous. Such portrayals equate women with this class of work even as the records of Bartholomew Fair reveal it is actually dominated by their male contemporaries. Literary and print depictions of fair disorder hinge on representations of disruptive women because this gendered deployment backed up by traditional understandings of women's place in social and spiritual order enabled artists and writers to underscore the imminent threat fairs posed to urban order. The most infamous group of unlicensed women at fairs who are not represented in the records of Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court—prostitutes—provided these writers with the best metaphor of the female threat to male industry and commerce.

Widows, Whores, and Masterless Women at London's Fairs

Unemployed, unmarried urban women or recent female immigrants to London often turned to crime or prostitution. This happened especially if women were cut off from their familial or community support systems.⁵² Streetwalkers freely inhabited urban streets as masterless women. In literary accounts, such women symbolized fair disorder because they obviously “flouted patriarchal rules for women's occupation of space.”⁵³ Written descriptions of fairs commonly depict them as areas in which many prostitutes worked. They especially associate the cloisters of St. Bartholomew's Hospital with

prostitutes, one reason why a 1707 poem about the varieties of prostitutes working in London is titled *A Cloyster in Bartholomew Fair*.⁵⁴

Areas associated with prostitution were often also considered especially dangerous for male fair-goers. In popular accounts of fairs, prostitutes specifically embody fair disorder, but even outside of fair time, prostitutes were visible in all areas of London. These women worked on London streets even as they became a growing space for middle-class promenading and display.⁵⁵ What made fairs unique, especially Bartholomew Fair, was the number of areas closed off from the view of the street in which one might procure a prostitute. It is not clear whether or not city officials feared this relative seclusion would make men more willing to solicit a prostitute, but being away from open public scrutiny made cloisters and the insides of play booths similar to brothel spaces (or “bawdy houses”). Bartholomew Fair may have been especially associated with a wide availability of prostitutes because of the ward in which it was located, Farringdon Without. The largest number of bawdy houses known to have existed in London between 1710 and 1749 was in this ward. Tony Henderson demonstrates that seventy of the total 110 known houses were located here.⁵⁶ It seems reasonable that just as London’s theater community took advantage of money-making opportunities at fairs, perhaps prostitutes from Farringdon Without’s bawdy houses similarly profited from fairs in the nearby cloisters and play booths of Bartholomew Fair. Prostitution is never mentioned specifically as a concern of city officials who attempted to regulate fairs, however. Their focus instead was on dangerous venues found at fairs (many of which would have been work spaces for prostitutes).

When, in 1735, city officials re-launched their campaign to stamp out illicit entertainment at fairs, they focused not on prostitution, but on theatrical, gambling and music booths. This year they issued an order based on one made originally in 1708. They hoped to restore Bartholomew and Southwark fairs to three days, but they specifically targeted any booths “not set up for Dealers in Goods and Merchandizes proper for a fair” or those which featured “stage plays, musick and Tipling.” The order targeting Southwark Fair gave bailiffs permission to pull down any “nuisance” booths.⁵⁷ Again, there is no specific definition of what constituted a nuisance booth, but the description of play booths provided by the author of *A Walk to Smithfield* suggests such activities may have been associated with notions of sexual immorality. This anonymous writer recorded the rowdiness of one play booth interior. In Fawkes’ booth, the protagonist alternates watching the intended show of a vaulting horse and a ladder dance with the unintended show of the audience, many of whom are female. Among the female audience members, he observes “the old game going forwards, all over the Booth.” This “old game,” included both the disguised and blatant sexuality of “the pretty Females” seated next to him. Some of these women appeared “coy and precise,” while others, “[appeared] otherwise tho when all came to all, there was little difference, for the first said nay and took it, and the other took it without saying anything, so that nothing but love’s Harmony could be seen from one side of the Booth to the other.”⁵⁸

Though the Aldermen’s 1735 order was directed at all music, gaming, drinking, or play booth managers, it is interesting that the long-time resident of Southwark and manager of a strolling company and fair play booths, Hannah Lee, was the only person targeted by this legislation. Lee ran her business with her mother, Anne Mynns, and

assumed the business after her mother's death. These women produced some of the most popular entertainments at fairs, including *The Siege of Troy*, which Mynns commissioned Elkanah Settle to write in 1705. Settle's drolls were, according to the well-known actor Theophilus Cibber, "generally so well contrived, that they exceeded those of their opponents in the same profession."⁵⁹ This droll had a typical dramatic narrative, but what made it attractive to audiences was its overabundance of spectacle. Drolls at Lee's booth were always popular, and a number of them were printed and sold at their booth.

Hannah Lee enjoyed much success as a fair booth proprietor and strolling acting company manager. She could not afford, however, to have her business curtailed by social reforming city fathers or members of Parliament. In 1735, the city issued its latest warning regarding the length of fairs and the inappropriateness of play booth entertainment. Their admonishment coincided with the proposal of a bill in Parliament that would curtail strolling companies of actors and impose limits on dramatic entertainments. Lee took action in the face of each threatened regulation, realizing the detrimental impact such legal changes would have on her livelihood. She took her objections to Parliament where, on 21 April 1735, she submitted a petition against the Playhouse Bill. She argued that her business and all of the funds she had invested in it were in danger. She estimated that she had put approximately £2000 or above into "Two Booths ... Buildings, Cloaths, Scenes, Decorations, and other necessities." Her strolling company had now become "her whole Substance ... on which she subsists," and she feared that "being now infirm in Body, and old, she must be ruined, if the Bill should pass into Law." In operating her business, she continued her mother's intention of running a respectable company. She argued to Parliament that she presented "innocent

and amusing” entertainments, which were patronized by many notable people. She also claimed that “her and her late Mother’s Companies have always been Nurseries for the greatest Performers that ever acted on the *British* Stage, particularly the celebrated Mr. *Powell* and Mr. *Booth*, as well as great Numbers of the present Actors at the Theatres of *Drury Lane* and *Covent Garden*.”⁶⁰ Though Lee’s petition to have her counsel speak against the bill was rejected, the bill was eventually withdrawn.⁶¹ Her business was safe from national regulation (at least until the passage of the 1737 Licensing Act), but the obstacle presented by the city remained.

Five months after petitioning Parliament and probably relieved at the stalling of the Playhouse Bill, Hannah Lee’s business was interrupted by the city. After issuing their warning that “nuisance booths” would be torn down by bailiffs, Lee, apparently ignoring this legislation, was targeted. On 23 September 1735, London’s Court of Aldermen and Common Council met and recorded that Lee had “erected a Booth in or near Southwark wherein [sic] she continues to Act Plays and Interludes in defiance of the law.”⁶² It is difficult to imagine that this woman who, only five months before, petitioned Parliament about the future of her business was not aware of the city’s latest attempts at legal regulation of fair booths. Her defiance reveals her belief that this legislation, as many previous orders, would not be enforced. She may have continued her business three weeks beyond the chartered time allocated to Southwark Fair in previous years, though this year she was aware that no national laws prohibited her dramatic entertainment. Whether knowing or not, Lee engaged in a contestation between local and national authorities. With the apparent sanction of Parliament, she challenged the authority of local officials to limit her business. Here was a woman who had publicly denounced

national legislation that would have assisted the city in its efforts to abolish play booth entertainment at fairs. Though her voice was actually of little legal consequence to Parliament, city officials nevertheless would have been aware of her participation in petitioning against the bill.

Hannah Lee's 1735 dismissal of city legislation and continuation of her business were poorly timed. Not only did her appearance in Parliament make her a sitting duck as far as local officials were concerned, but her sex certainly did not help matters. As a female play booth proprietor, she exemplified the threat to the commercial (and masculine) space London's officials wanted to create. Not only did she provide entertainment London's officials called a "growing evil with mischievous consequences," but she did this as a woman. A thriving female play booth proprietor represented a double threat—she was the ultimate temptress luring men away from productive labor, using both femininity and spectacle. One wonders to what extent visual and literary depictions of unruly women at fairs influenced how city fathers perceived Hannah Lee. Though she had, indeed, run a respectable and popular family business throughout the early-eighteenth century, it was during this time that many vivid and misogynist depictions of women who worked at fairs—particularly as performers—were produced.

For whatever reason, Southwark's bailiff informed on Hannah Lee in late September, 1735.⁶³ Lee was summoned by the court, and, though the record is not clear, her entertainment most likely ceased. While this incident can be read as evidence that certain occupations made women more susceptible to legal or social sanction, it also demonstrates how one woman continued her business despite notions about women's work at fairs. Here we have a strong business woman, carrying on her mother's business

and doing so without consideration of or appealing to her gender. In the historical record there is no evidence that Lee found her gender an impediment to her rights or success as a business owner. She believed her livelihood was worthy of government protection regardless of the fact that she was a woman. As a business owner, she petitioned Parliament, never showing any indication that she believed her status as a woman might hinder her appeal. As a resident and business owner within the jurisdiction of London, she hoped to profit from the public demand for entertainment. By flouting city legislation inhibiting her business, she acted as countless other play booth proprietors who also extended their shows long after fairs had ended. Hannah Lee viewed city and Parliamentary legislation, not her sex, as the only impediment to her business.

There is other evidence that women who worked in managerial positions at fairs did not see themselves as participating in a “male” profession. In most cases, they merely continued a family-run business. Another Leigh, widow of the play booth proprietor Francis Leigh, continued her husband’s business after his death in 1719. In the five years prior to his death, Leigh purchased a license to show at Bartholomew Fair in 1714 and jointly in 1715 with Jacob Spiller. In 1719, we know his wife continued his partnership with William Bullock, which the two men had established in 1717. When Leigh assumed her husband’s business, however, she did not purchase a license (neither did Bullock, this year, though he did in 1720).⁶⁴ We can only speculate as to why, but it may perhaps have been due to the expenses related to the death of Francis Leigh and their impact on Leigh and Bullock’s ability to purchase a license. In Bartholomew Fair’s Pie Powder Court rolls, it is apparent that both men and women evaded licensing. This gender neutral aversion to the legal process of obtaining a license makes it difficult to

determine whether or not having access to ready capital impacted decisions to acquire a license and if having excess funds for licenses always related to gender.

Access to capital was not the main motivating factor behind a fair exhibitor's decision to obtain a license legally. In particular, Timothy Fielding, an actor and seemingly prosperous play booth proprietor, was called into court by the constable of 1732's Bartholomew Fair for "showing an interlude called a Droll without licence from the court, and for words spoken in the same, in contempt of the court."⁶⁵ What this reveals is that, in most years, licensing violations went unnoticed. Fielding was apparently prosecuted more for the "words spoken" in his droll (which had supposedly been attended by the Prince and Princesses of Wales) than for his initial evasion of the licensing process. Along with his partner, John Hippisley, Fielding presented *The Envious Statesman or The fall of Essex* and *Humours of the Forced Physician*, which was taken from Moliere's *Le Médecin Malgré Lui*. This year's entertainment was particularly elaborate, including a large acting company of eleven men and seven women, as well as three dancers, and an extra band.⁶⁶ Perhaps Fielding and Hippisley were overextended from hiring so many performers, but it seems more likely they did not believe obtaining a license was mandatory (unless brought into court, after which Fielding did purchase a license and promised to "act lawfully in the future."). Something about their entertainment stood out, attracting the attention of the constable. From an examination of the limited evidence pertaining to licensing at Bartholomew Fair in the early-eighteenth century, purchasing a license to show at the fair does not appear to have been more likely for male rather than female play booth proprietors, though when men ran businesses with their wives, men seem to have sought the license instead of their wives.

In some cases, historians' own expectations of women's work identities at fairs lead them to misinterpret evidence. When the famous conjuror Isaac Fawkes died in 1731, Sybil Rosenfeld assumes that "Fawkes's son set up a rival show [to Fawkes' main competitor, Yeates] next to Lee and Harper's."⁶⁷ In fact, the Pie Powder Court register for that year lists an "Alicia Fawkes," who purchased a license on the feast day of St. Bartholomew.⁶⁸ Advertisements upon which Rosenfeld made her conclusion apparently made no mention of the young Fawkes' sex, which may demonstrate a hesitancy to label oneself "female" in offering this style of entertainment, but it may also reveal that the Fawkes franchise centered on the father's name and skills. In any case, it is not possible to know how Alicia Fawkes fared. There are no further advertisements for the Fawkes family's entertainments, and the Pie Powder Court rolls end in 1732; however, this case demonstrates that there were no rigid gender expectations about whether or not men or women were more suitable to run play booth entertainment in the early-eighteenth century.

Conclusion: Complicating Notions about Gender and Work

This article began with Ned Ward's depiction of the dangerous "black widow" woman pickpocket of Bartholomew Fair. This passage best reveals the tensions inherent in layering over urban festivity with a new type of mannered and masculine civility. What my evidence suggests is that London women who profited from their work at fairs managed to stay in business in spite of assaults on their character as fair workers and in the face of city officials' and middling men's new notions of commerce and the city. From the woman feigning helpless femininity in the crowd to the rope dancer exposing her thigh or the widow play booth proprietor continuing her shows in the face of

regulation, women tested the bounds of their representative confinement and found them much more flexible than literary and print depictions suggest. We must consider historical occasions of women's own response to misogynist representations of their work or regulatory efforts to curtail their labor. As notions of women's proper urban work space shifted in the early-eighteenth century, female fair workers responded to, ignored, or reconfigured themselves in the face of efforts to regulate their available occupations. Without institutionalized or uniform understandings of *all* women's appropriate work, and in the absence of economic conditions which would allow working women to vacate the streets of London, women remained active participants in the city's work force.

Fair records complicate our understandings of gender and work in interesting ways, and they provide us one means of looking behind literary and visual depictions of women at fairs, which are often misleading about the everyday working lives of these women. Yes, late-seventeenth and eighteenth-century city officials and social critics developed new ideas about how urban streets should be used. They *did* consider the city appropriate only for controlled commerce which was tied up with certain notions about polite masculinity. Pamphlet literature *was* extremely critical of the women on "show" at fairs—but for every new idea about what was appropriate work for women in London, women who made a living at fairs found ways around those new ideas. They reshaped themselves and their labor, or just carried on in the face of gendered understandings of urban work space.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Corporation of London Records Office
Repertories of the Court of Aldermen

Highclere Castle Archive
Pie Powder Court Rolls, St. Bartholomew Fair

London Metropolitan Archives
Middlesex Sessions of the Peace

Guildhall Library
Smithfield Court Book Proceedings in Court of Piepowder, 1790-1854. MS 95

Proceedings of the Old Bailey

Printed Sources

Amussen, Susan Dwyer. "The Gendering of Popular Culture in England," in Tim Harris, ed. *Popular Culture in England, c. 1500- 1850*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

------. *An Ordered Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Ballaster, Rosalind, et. al. *Women's Worlds: Ideology, Femininity and the Woman's Magazine*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1991.

Bancks, John. *Miscellaneous works, in verse and prose, of John Bancks*. London, 1738.

Barker-Benefield, G.J. *Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bartholomew Fair: An Heroi-Comical Poem. London, 1717.

Beattie, James. "The Criminality of Women in Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of Social History*, 8 (1975).

Clark, Alice. *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*. 1919. Reprint, New York, A.M. Kelley, 1968.

Clark, Anna. *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class*. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1995.

The Cloyster in Bartholomew Fair; or, The Town Mistress Disguis'd. London, A Banks, 1707.

Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850.* London : Hutchinson Education, 1987.

Davis, Natalie. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Davison, Lee, Tim Hitchcock, et al. *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689-1750.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Dugaw, Dianne. *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry, 1650-1850.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1989.

Earle, Peter. *A City Full of People: Men and Women of London, 1650-1750.* London: Methuen, 1994.

-----, *The Making of the English Middle Class, Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660-1730.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

Fort, Bernadette and Angela Rosenthal, eds. *The Other Hogarth, Aesthetics of Difference.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons. *Journals of the House of Commons, 1735, rpt. 1803-1813.*

Hall, Catherine, ed. *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Henderson, Tony. *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London: Prostitution and Control in the Metropolis, 1730-1830.* London and New York: Longman, 1999.

Hill, Bridget. *Women, Work, and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century England.* Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Hufton, Olwen. *The Prospect Before Her, A History of Women in Western Europe, 1500-1800.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

An Historical Account of Bartholomew Fair: containing a view of its origin, and the purposes it was first instituted for . Together with a concise detail of the changes it hath undergone in its traffic, amusements, &c. &c. London: John Arliss, 1810.

- Johnson, E.D.H. *Paintings of the British Social Scene from Hogarth to Sickert*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986.
- Jones, Vivien, ed. *Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity*. London ; New York : Routledge, 1990.
- . *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700-1800*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Jordan, Constance. *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Langford, Paul. *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb, eds. *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Europa Publications, 1982.
- Malcolmson, Robert W. *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Morley, Henry. *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair*. 1880. Reprint, Detroit, Michigan: Singing Tree Press, 1968.
- Pinchbeck, Ivy. *Women Workers and The Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1930. Reprint, New York: A.M. Kelley, 1969.
- Rendell, Jane. "The Pursuit of Pleasure: London Rambling." Neil Leach, ed. *The Hieroglyphics of Space: Reading and Experiencing the Modern Metropolis*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Roberts, Michael. "'Words they are Women, and Deeds they are Men': Images of Work and Gender in Early Modern England." Lindsey Charles and Lorna Duffin, eds. *Women and Work in Pre-Industrial England*. London, Sydney and Dover, NH: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Rogers, Katharine. *Feminism in Eighteenth-Century England*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1982.
- Roper, Lyndal. *The Holy Household: Women and Morals in Reformation Augsburg*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Rosenfeld, Sybil. *The Theatre of the London Fairs in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

- Shevelov, Kathryn. *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Spufford, Margaret. *The Great Reclothing of Rural England: Petty Chapmen and Their Wares in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Hambledon Press, 1984.
- Todd, Janet. *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660-1800*. London: Virago, 1989.
- Valenze, Deborah. *The First Industrial Woman*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History." *The Historical Journal*, 36, 2 (1993): 383-414.
- A Walk to Smith-field; or, A True Discription [sic] of the Humours of Bartholomew-Fair, with the many comical Intrigues and Frolicks that are acted in every particular Booth in the Fair, by Persons of all Ages and Sexes, from the Court Gallant to the Countrey Clown*. London: 1701.
- Ward, Edward. *The London Spy*. London: J. How, 1709, fourth edition. Randolph Trumbach, ed. *Marriage, Sex and the Family in England 1660-1800*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1985.
- Wheatley, Henry. *Hogarth's London*. London: Constable and Company, 1909.
- Wiesner, Merry. *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. 1993. Reprint, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . *Working Women in Renaissance Germany*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Wiltburg, Joy. *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992.
- Wohlcke, Anne. "Ordering London at Play: The Regulation of Urban Amusement, 1692-1732." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Irvine, 2004.
- Wunder, Heide. *He is the Sun, She is the Moon: Women in Early Modern Germany*. Translated by Thomas Dunlap. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Notes

1. Edward Ward, *The London Spy* (London: J. How, 1709), fourth edition, in Randolph Trumbach, ed., *Marriage, Sex and the Family in England 1660-1800* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1985), 248.
2. *Ibid.*, 248-49.
3. See Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, eds., *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Europa Publications, 1982); Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England, 1727-1783* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).
4. Michael Roberts discusses attitudes about early modern English working women in his analysis of representations of women in “characters,” and pastoral poetry, “ ‘Words they are Women, and Deeds they are Men’: Images of Work and Gender in Early Modern England,” in Lindsey Charles and Lorna Duffin, *Women and Work in Pre-Industrial England* (London, Sydney and Dover, NH: Croom Helm, 1985), 145-151; see also Joy Wiltenburg, *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992), and Dianne Dugaw, *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry, 1650-1850* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1989).
5. For an examination of representations of women in periodical literature and novels consumed by middle-class audiences, see: Rosalind Ballaster, et al., *Women's Worlds: Ideology, Femininity and the Woman's Magazine* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1991); G.J. Barker-Benfield, *Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Katharine Rogers, *Feminism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1982); Kathryn Shevelov, *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989); Janet Todd, *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660-1800* (London: Virago, 1989); Vivien Jones, ed., *Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity* (London ; New York : Routledge, 1990); and Vivien Jones, ed., *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700-1800* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
6. Lee Davison, Tim Hitchcock, et al., *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689-1750* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), xxvi-xxvii.
7. Peter Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class, Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660-1730* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989).
8. *Ibid.*, 10.
9. In a series of legislation from the late seventeenth through mid-eighteenth centuries, London's Court of Aldermen and the Middlesex County Justices limited (for the most part unsuccessfully) and sought legal means to abolish several London-area fairs. See Anne Wohlcke, “Ordering London at Play: The Regulation of Urban Amusement, 1692-1732” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Irvine, 2004).
10. Robert W. Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973); and Earle.
11. Roberts, 134-36.
12. *Ibid.*, 153.
13. Susan Dwyer Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 43-47; See also Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England, 1500-1720* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993). The ways in which families were an important aspect of social order in early modern Germany are explored in Lyndal Roper, *The Holy Household: Women and Morals in Reformation Augsburg* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Wiesner, *Working Women in Renaissance Germany* (New Brunswick, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986); and Heide Wunder, translated by Thomas Dunlap, *He is the Sun, She is the Moon: Women in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).
14. See below, especially Hannah Lee, who worked as a successful strolling company manager, or Sarah Ansell, who sold fruit from her family's cellar window, though she did so apart from her husband's immediate supervision.
15. Wiltenburg, 7-9. For an analysis of the idea of “topsy-turvy” gender order in popular culture, see Natalie Davis, “Women on Top,” in *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, CA:

Stanford University Press, 1975). See also Susan Dwyer Amussen, "The Gendering of Popular Culture," in Tim Harris, ed., *Popular Culture in England, c. 1500-1850* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 67.

16. See Wohlcke, especially Chapter 3.

17. Their concerns are voiced in late-seventeenth through mid-eighteenth court records as they attempted to regulate London's fairs. A common concern was that fair booths presenting plays, exhibitions, music, lotteries or offering drink were places, "to which the Worst and Lewdest of both Sexes resort," that fairs were sites of "frequent Bloodsheds, Tumults and Disorders [which] daily happen to the terror of the Inhabitants and others," and that at fairs, "... the Apprentices, Servants and Youth of and about this City are debauched." Repertories of the Court of Aldermen, 98, f. 410.

18. Deborah Valenze, *The First Industrial Woman* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); and Bridget Hill, *Women, Work and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell Press, 1989).

19. Ward, 240.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Wiltenburg, 8. For an in-depth analysis of ideas regarding women, see Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990).

22. See Amussen, Crawford.

23. See, Henry Wheatley, *Hogarth's London* (London: Constable and Company, 1909), 427; E.D.H. Johnson, *Paintings of the British Social Scene from Hogarth to Sickert* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986), 25-27; Bernadette Fort and Angela Rosenthal, eds., *The Other Hogarth, Aesthetics of Difference* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 83.

24. John Bancks. *Miscellaneous works, in verse and prose, of John Bancks*, (London, 1738).

25. *Bartholomew Fair: An Heroi-Comical Poem*, (London, 1717).

26. *An Historical Account of Bartholomew Fair: containing a view of its origin, and the purposes it was first instituted for. Together with a concise detail of the changes it hath undergone in its traffic, amusements, &c. &c.* (London: John Arliss, No. 87 Bartholomew Close, 1810), 11-12. BL 11644 c 55.

27. *Bartholomew Fair: An Heroi-Comical Poem*.

28. Amanda Vickery began a productive interrogation of such categories as "separate spheres" and "domesticity" as it has been understood by women's historians in her "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *The Historical Journal*, 36, 2 (1993), 383-414.

29. See especially Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850* (London: Hutchinson Education, 1987); Catherine Hall, ed., *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Anna Clark has examined the ways in which women and men of the working class understood and responded to notions of "separate spheres" in her work, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

30. See Alice Clark and Pinchbeck; Wiesner argues that early modern Polish women, for example, constituted more than three-quarters of traders at urban markets, in *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993; reprint, 2000), 117.

31. Olwen Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her, A History of Women in Western Europe, 1500-1800* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 77.

32. Pinchbeck's discussion of female peddlers remains valuable, 300.

33. Wiesner, *Working Women in Renaissance Germany*; Alice Clark.

34. Women who worked in managerial positions included Hannah Lee and her mother, Anne Mynns, proprietors of a London company of strolling actors and Alicia Fawkes, who continued her father's booth after his death.

35. The exact origins of the term "Pie Powder" is unknown. Scholars have argued either that it comes from the French for "dusty feet" because fairs were usually held during the dusty summer months, or that it comes from the old French name for a peddler, "pied puldreaux." Henry Morley, *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair* (1880; Detroit, Michigan: Singing Tree Press, 1968), 76-79.

36. These earlier court rolls from Bartholomew Fair's Pie Powder Court are held by the Earl of Carnarvon at Highclere Castle in Oxfordshire. I am especially indebted to his archivist, Jennifer Thorpe,

for realizing the richness of this historical source, cataloguing the court rolls with the National Register of Archives, and for her transcription of these rolls.

37. Smithfield Court Book proceedings in Court of Piepowder, 1790-1854. Guildhall Library, MS 95.

38. See above.

39. The best example is the successful play booth proprietor Hannah Lee, who is discussed in more detail below.

40. As was Timothy Fielding in Ref. HB C7 (St. Bartholomew's Fair, Middlesex: Piepowder Court Roll 1723-1732), Membr. 10r. See below.

41. See Margaret Spufford, *The Great Reclothing of Rural England: Petty Chapmen and Their Wares in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984). Spufford argues that though the government began taxing street traders by the late seventeenth century, many women traded without licenses. See also, Alice Clark and Pinchbeck; both have demonstrated that this occupation was dominated by women. Bridget Hill sees increasing numbers of hawkers in London during the late eighteenth century.

42. Peter Earle, *A City Full of People: Men and Women of London, 1650-1750* (London: Methuen, 1994), 149.

43. *Ibid.*, 147.

44. Proceedings of the Old Bailey, 6 September 1732, Ref: t17320906-20.

45. *Ibid.*, 16 October 1734, Ref: t17341016-23.

46. *Ibid.*, 16 October 1734, Ref: t17341016-22.

47. William Hogarth, *Southwark Fair*, 1733.

48. St. Bartholomew's Fair: Piepowder Court Rolls, Ref. HB. C6 and C7, Highclere Castle Archive.

49. Morley, 297.

50. Sybil Rosenfeld, *The Theatre of the London Fairs in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960). See Chapter 2.

51. *Ibid.*, 44.

52. John Beattie, "The Criminality of Women in Eighteenth-Century England," *Journal of Social History* 8 (1975), 80-116, 95-97; Tony Henderson, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London: Prostitution and Control in the Metropolis, 1730-1830* (London and New York: Longman, 1999).

53. Jane Rendell, "The Pursuit of Pleasure: London Rambling," in Neil Leach, ed. *The Hieroglyphics of Space: Reading and Experiencing the Modern Metropolis* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 107.

54. *A Cloyster in Bartholomew Fair* (London, 1707).

55. Henderson, 107-8.

56. *Ibid.*, 64.

57. Repertories of the Court of Aldermen, 139, 233 and 240.

58. A Walk to Smith-field; or, A True Discription [sic] of the Humours of Bartholomew-Fair, with the many comical Intrigues and Frolicks that are acted in every particular Booth in the Fair, by Persons of all Ages and Sexes, from the Court Gallant to the Countrey Clown (London: 1701), 2-3.

59. Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons. *Journals of the House of Commons*, (1735, rpt.1803-1813), 470.

60. *Ibid.*

61. *Ibid.*

62. Rep. 139, 233.

63. *Ibid.*

64. Ref. HB. C6 (St. Bartholomew's Fair, Middlesex: Piepowder Court Roll, 1709-1722).

65. Ref. HB C7 (St. Bartholomew's Fair, Middlesex: Piepowder Court Roll 1723-1732), Membr. 10r.

66. Rosenfeld, 37.

67. *Ibid.*

68. Ref. HB C7 (St. Bartholomew's Fair, Middlesex: Piepowder Court Roll 1723-1732), Membr. 10r.